



**PERMANENT MISSION OF THE  
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA TO THE  
UNITED NATIONS**  
201 EAST 42ND STREET, SUITE #1700  
NEW YORK NY 10017  
TEL: 1-212-972-9160  
FAX: 1-212-682-5232



**PERMANENT MISSION OF  
IRELAND TO THE  
UNITED NATIONS**  
1 DAG HAMMARSKJÖLD PLAZA  
885 SECOND AVENUE, 19TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK NY 10017  
TEL: 1-212-421-6934  
FAX: 1-212-752-4726

**United Nations System-wide Coherence: Funding**

**Joint Statement by the UN General Assembly Co-Chairs  
on System-wide Coherence**

**Concluding Statement**

**Delivered by**

**H.E. Ambassador Augustine Mahiga**

**Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania  
to the United Nations, New York**

**at Informal Consultations in the General Assembly**

**Monday, 7 April 2008**

United Nations System-wide Coherence: Funding

Concluding Remarks:

H.E. Ambassador Augustine Mahiga

Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania  
to the United Nations, New York

at Informal Consultations in the General Assembly

Monday, 7 April 2008

**Excellencies,**

On behalf of my Co-Chair, Colleague and a friend, Ambassador Paul Kavanagh, I thank all of you as individual Member States or members of various groups who have participated in these consultations this afternoon on Funding for System-wide Coherence. As Co-Chairs, we have been reminded by members of the Assembly to reply to some outstanding procedural issues which have already been referred to in the statement of my colleague, Ambassador Paul Kavanagh. But let me also add more clarity to them.

We take due consideration of the JCC views on the procedures leading to decision making at the end of our mandate but not necessarily the end of the process of the consultations on System wide Coherence which will continue. As Co-Chairs the mandate given to us by the President is to advance the intergovernmental process, this, we believe, is exactly what we are doing. Our report in June 2008 will be an honest reflection of what we have heard and where we have reached. We are therefore encouraged and guided by your flexible preferences for a process, which would evolve from the on-going consultations.

We totally agree with the well-considered view to give us sufficient “buy in” and support from all stakeholders to ensure full ownership by all of us, by this consultative process. We have signaled to you that whatever we include in these consultations should meet your approval based on pragmatic considerations and which would be amendable to consensual decision. We have informed you at every stage in our informal consultations with you, in our statements and in our letters to you.

As Co-Chairs, we have repeatedly stated that our mandate is not a substitute for the evaluation of the pilots, which will take place at the end of next year. The terms of reference for the evaluation will certainly need to be acceptable to the Assembly and the methodology to be used would also have to be accepted by the Assembly without prejudicing the independence and professional competence of the evaluation experts.

The “no size-fits all” concern cannot be over-emphasized; that was the first observation which struck us when we visited the four pilots last month. The differences are underpinned by the different nationally owned development frame-works and strategies which answer to the needs of the individual countries concerned.

We subscribe to the view that measuring effectiveness has to be a professional undertaking on a continuous basis by the Resident Coordinator and his team. The performance and outcomes would be subjected to further scrutiny by the independent evaluation experts at the end of 2009. We hope as the comparisons are drawn between the pilots and the non-pilots, the merits and limitations of the UNDAF frame-work will be highlighted and other forms of coordination mechanisms would be explored. However, what is evident so far is that several non-pilot countries had already seen the advantages of ‘Delivering as One’ by the UN system long before the panel was appointed and its recommendations made public. Others are also voluntarily opting for the approach.

The ‘Delivering as One’ process has also instituted important and comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation frameworks. These frameworks provide indicators on progress. Most importantly, these frameworks can provide insight into the work the UN is doing, to ensure that it is indeed in line with national priorities and will have positive effects for the people on the ground. These frameworks are essential for the developing countries concerned, the UN Agencies, and the development partners and will provide the basis from which the UN can improve and strengthen its strategic focus. But it cannot be denied that these frameworks can also provide evidence of the effectiveness, efficiency and added value of the UN and in doing so will increase the UN’s attractiveness to development partners.

## **Excellencies,**

As the President of the General Assembly pointed out in his statement at our opening consultations on 7<sup>th</sup> February, the UN is working in a competitive environment in the fight against poverty and if it fails to reform itself it will be unable to maintain its position at the heart of the multilateral system. This reality was also evident to us in our recent trip to the Pilot countries where, despite its unique legitimacy, the UN is becoming an increasingly marginalized actor, as it struggles to adapt itself to the development challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, where Government-leadership, and development partner coherence and alignment, form the basis of aid effectiveness. There is, therefore, an urgent need to address this marginalization if the UN is to remain relevant and retain the central position compared to other multilateral organizations, which its unique legitimacy and convening power demands.

The issue of funding is one of central importance to the way the UN operates, and therefore, to discussions on System-wide Coherence. It has frequently been highlighted by all member States as a key priority. As noted in the JCC Statement, ‘inadequate and unpredictable funding of the System contributes to fragmentation, and risks undermining the multilateral character of the United Nations’. As has been repeatedly pointed out to us, the way the UN is funded greatly influences the way that it operates.

Your Co-Chairs believe that the best point of departure for addressing the development pillar is how to improve the funding of the UN system, so that it may deliver better results for the people it serves. Throughout our consultations, we were encouraged by the fact that many member states we have met in the run-up to this consultation, have shared this view.

As was outlined in the TCP, it cannot be denied that in order for the UN system to function effectively, the correct balance between core and non-core funding must be struck. Predictable and sustainable funding of the UN system is desirable by UN membership in order to maintain and build its long-term capacity. Currently, we are living in an increasingly globalised world where many developing countries look to the UN to provide high-level, top quality policy support, in addressing complex global issues, such as the transition from a least developed country to a middle income country,

the affects of climate change, increased desertification and global health problems such as HIV/AIDS.

Without an adequate balance between core and non-core funding, the UN will be unable to retain the global expertise necessary to fulfill this role and to maximise its unique legitimacy, its unique convening power and its unique knowledge base.

In order to change this eventuality, we need to work towards establishing systems which encourage coherence. Donors need to ensure that the way they fund the System encourages coherence, by providing predictable, multi-annual and unearmarked funding, which strikes the appropriate balance between core and non-core funding.

Any cost savings which are made should be 'ploughed back' into programme work – this was agreed in the TCPR and your Co-Chairs have not heard a single dissenting voice in relation to this proposition in the course of our many consultations. On our mission to the 'Delivering as One' pilots we saw evidence of where this has already happened and further evidence of work underway to continue and increase savings, so that they may be redeployed towards helping those who need it most, whether it be providing electricity in villages in Mozambique or providing training course for people in Cape Verde. We understand that changes must take place to institutionalize and facilitate this practice among the Funds, Programmes and Agencies and we look forward to progress in this regard. We feel that this is an important point of agreement in relation to these discussions. We shall take this message to the headquarters of the various agencies and we request you to repeat it in the respective Boards of the Funds, Programmes and Agencies.

The 'Delivering as One' process, by the very fact that it is Government-driven and in line with national priorities, has demonstrated that it could attract more funding, than the previous fragmented Agency specific projects. The One UN programme, supported by the One UN budgetary framework has brought a new clarity of purpose and vision to the UN's work at country level, which could enhance its potential to mobilise resources. This method of working seems to reduce internal competition for funding, as Agency representatives at all levels are free to concentrate on the important work at hand:

Delivering Development Results in line with the needs of the Developing country concerned.

**Excellencies,**

I agree with all of you that the funding issue is at the core of the development pillar of the UN as underlined by your enlightened messages this afternoon. I hope you also subscribe to the spirit of the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness which will be further pursued by the member States in Ghana later this year. It should also be accepted that the development process should have only one major inbuilt consideration; that is, if tried approaches to development do not deliver positive results, those approaches must be reviewed and reformed. The UN development system must be ready to face the challenge. The TPCR consensus resolution is the way to address the challenge. In this regard, I quote paragraph 32 of that resolution which 'Emphasises that increasing financial contributions to the United Nations development system is key to achieving the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, and in this regard recognizes the mutually reinforcing links between increased effectiveness, efficiency and coherence of the United Nations development system, achieving concrete results in assisting developing countries to eradicate poverty and achieve sustained economic growth and sustainable development through operational activities for development and the overall resourcing of the United Nations development system' will provide us all with a point of departure in moving forward.

**Excellencies,**

In both our opening and closing statements today, we hope we have responded to the concerns raised by various member states. We have paid attention to the mandates, role, functions, and identity of agencies, fund and programmes in connection with United Nations System wide Coherence. Delegation will wish to know that your Co-Chairs intend in the coming weeks to confer with the leadership of a number of specialized agencies on how to bring greater synergy between their respective headquarters and the field.

**I thank you for your kind attention.**